

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Paul Fernand Wilms

Serial No.: 10/785,108

Group Art Unit: 2166

Filed: 2/25/2004

Examiner: Usmaan Saeed

Title: *Dynamically Capturing Data Warehouse Population Activities for Analysis, Archival, and Mining*

**REPLY BRIEF**

Attn: Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Appeal Brief filed 8/13/2007, and the Examiner's Answer dated 11/13/2007, Applicants submit the following reply.

## **REMARKS**

This Reply Brief is in response to the Examiner's Answer dated 11/13/2007. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing remarks. In addition, all of the arguments in the appeal brief of 8/13/2007 and prior responses should also be considered in support of the claimed elements provided in the present invention.

## **STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1-17 and 19-38 are pending.

Claims 1-17 and 19-38 are rejected.

Claims 1-17 and 19-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,668,253) in view of Norcott (U.S. Pub. Appl. 2003/0172091).

Claims 1-17 and 19-38 are hereby appealed.

## **RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

In the response to the arguments section of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner cites column 1, lines 46-47 of Thompson as teaching claim 1's feature of extracting task information from operational metadata". Column 1, lines 46-47 merely recites the feature of "extracting of data from operational systems", which by Thompson's own admission this data relates to financial data. For example see Thompson's own statement in column 1, lines 49-51, which specifically state that the processing of such financial data requires that "a common chart of accounts is developed for financials, accounts are summarized and adjustments are made." Further, Thompson also teaches a financial consolidation application connected to a transformation and staging server for performing consolidation and reporting of financial data.

Applicants maintain that there is no mention either in the Examiner's citation or the entire Thompson reference for a data-warehousing environment where changes in operational metadata are obtained from such a data warehousing environment and task information is extracted from such metadata.

Applicants are still unsure how the Examiner is equating such extraction of financial data from operational systems to Applicants' features of obtaining operational metadata containing task information relevant to uniquely identified tasks in a data warehousing environment. Further, although columns 32-33 discusses metadata, columns 32-33 fail to teach the extraction of task information from such metadata.

Further, in the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner states that he interprets updating of the load statistics metadata and renaming of the temporary table/buffer to the load table to equate to claim 1's feature of refreshing said buffer with changes in operational metadata. It is once again pointed out that the Examiner's citation merely teaches the two ways anticipated by Thompson for loading information – one being the round-robin approach and the other being the see-saw approach – and cannot be equated to the step of refreshing a buffer (with extracted task information) with changes in operational metadata.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner also relies on paragraph [0035] of Norcott as teaching "changes in operational metadata". However, paragraph [0035] of Norcott merely teaches standard database operations wherein when data is changed, the updated data is inserted in the table. There is, however, no teaching or suggestion for storing changes in operational metadata.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner yet again maintains that the Abstract of Thompson teaches Applicants' feature of "moving task information from said buffer to an archive". The Abstract of Thompson merely teaches a transformation and staging server that obtains data from the data source application via requests and places the data into temporary staging tables to prepare for the transformation and cleansing process prior to movement of the data to the data warehouse server. Applicants' maintain that such a teaching the feature of transforming and cleansing data prior to movement to a server cannot be equated to Applicants' step of moving task information from a buffer (that held the task information that was extracted from operational metadata) to an archive.

The Examiner once again maintains that claim 10's feature of "uniquely identifying each task within a run" is taught by the Thompson reference in column 2, lines 2-4 and column 5, lines 2-4. By the Examiner's own admission, Thompson's citation merely teaches an Enterprise Management System that includes data extraction and movement, data transformation and cleansing, database updated and tuning, and database access. Such a teaching in Thompson cannot be equated to the Applicants feature of uniquely identifying tasks within a run. Applicants maintain that none of the four tasks mentioned in column 2, lines 2-4 can be equated to Applicants claimed feature of identifying tasks within the run. Similarly, the other citation by the Examiner of column 5, lines 2-4 (of Thompson) merely teaches updating load statistics metadata for each table. Such a feature of loading/uploading statistics cannot be equated to Applicants' claimed feature of uniquely identifying tasks within a run.

In the Examiner's Answer, with respect to claim 10, the Examiner once again equates Thompson column 5, lines 2-4 as teaching Applicants' feature of selecting one or more of said uniquely identified tasks to monitor. However, column 5, lines 2-4, as mentioned in the Appeal Brief, merely teaches an indication that information is in a loading state. Such a feature of a state associated with loading/unloading CANNOT be equated to Applicants' claimed feature of selecting or more uniquely identified tasks to monitor.

Applicants, therefore, maintain that the combination of Thompson and Norcott fail to teach many of the features of Applicants' claims 1 and 10. The same arguments also apply to independent claim 30, which is an article of manufacture claim.

With regards to independent claim 29, the Examiner states that the ETL task performed by Thompson can be equated to Applicants' trigger mechanism that is attached to a staging table that stores task information extracted from operational metadata. As mentioned earlier, triggers 115 are merely means for "firing an action routing" when "rows are inserted, updated, or deleted" and are not trigger mechanisms that are attached to operational metadata.

Applicants, therefore, maintain that the combination of Thompson and Norcott fail to teach many of the features of Applicants' claim 29.

The above-mentioned arguments for claims 1, 10, 29, and 30 substantially apply to dependent claims 2-9, 11-17, 19-28, and 31-38 as they inherit all the features of the claim from which they depend.

**SUMMARY**

None of the references, cited or applied, provide for the specific claimed details of applicants' presently claimed invention, nor renders them obvious. It is believed that this case is in condition for allowance and reconsideration thereof and early issuance is respectfully requested.

As this Reply Brief has been timely filed within the set period of response, no petition for extension of time or associated fee is required. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies in the fees provided to Deposit Account No. 50-4098.

Respectfully submitted,

*/ramraj soundararajan/*

Ramraj Soundararajan  
Registration No. 53,832

IP Authority, LLC  
4821A Eisenhower Ave  
Alexandria, VA 22304

January 14, 2008